

1070-11808
NASA CR-106910


Office of Naval Research

Contract N00014-67-A-0298-0006 NR-372-012

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Grant NGR 22-007-068

NEW NECESSARY CONDITIONS OF OPTIMALITY FOR CONTROL PROBLEMS WITH STATE-VARIABLE INEQUALITY CONSTRAINTS



CASE FILE
COPY

By

D. H. Jacobson, M. M. Lele, and J. L. Speyer

August 1969

Technical Report No. 597

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted by the U. S. Government.

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics
Harvard University • Cambridge, Massachusetts

Office of Naval Research
Contract N00014-67-A-0298-0006
NR-372-012

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Grant NGR 22-007-068

NEW NECESSARY CONDITIONS OF OPTIMALITY FOR CONTROL
PROBLEMS WITH STATE-VARIABLE INEQUALITY CONSTRAINTS

By

D. H. Jacobson, M. M. Lele, and J. L. Speyer

Technical Report No. 597

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted by the U. S. Government.

August 1969

The research reported in this document was made possible through support extended the Division of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University by the U. S. Army Research Office, the U. S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research and the U. S. Office of Naval Research under the Joint Services Electronics Program by Contracts N00014-67-A-0298-0006, 0005, and 0008 and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under Grant NGR 22-007-068.

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics
Harvard University · Cambridge, Massachusetts

NEW NECESSARY CONDITIONS OF OPTIMALITY FOR CONTROL PROBLEMS WITH STATE-VARIABLE INEQUALITY CONSTRAINTS

By

D. H. Jacobson, M. M. Lele, and J. L. Speyer*

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics

Harvard University · Cambridge, Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Necessary conditions of optimality for state-variable inequality constrained problems are derived by examining the limiting behavior of the Kelley penalty function technique. The conditions so obtained differ from those presently known, with regard to the behavior of the adjoint variables at junctions of interior and boundary arcs. A second, rigorous, derivation is given; this confirms the necessary conditions obtained by the limiting argument. These conditions are related to those known earlier; in particular, it is shown that the earlier conditions over-specify the behavior of the adjoint variables at the junctions. An example is used to demonstrate that the earlier conditions may yield non-stationary trajectories.

For the regular case, it is shown that, under certain conditions, only boundary points, as opposed to boundary arcs, are possible. An analytic example illustrates this behavior.

* Senior Analyst, Analytical Mechanics Associates Inc.; this work supported by NASA Contract NAS 12-656.

1. Introduction

Necessary conditions for the optimality of state-variable inequality constrained problems have been the subject of much research in the past ten years. Gamkrelidze [1], in 1960, approached the problem via the Pontryagin maximum principle. He adjoined the first time-derivative of the constraint -- which explicitly contained the control by his 'regularity' assumption -- to the cost functional and treated the resulting problem as one with a control constraint. Berkovitz [2], in 1962, derived the same conditions as in [1], by way of the classical calculus of variations. He too used the first time-derivative of the constraint, which, by his constraint qualifications, contained the control.

Bryson, Denham and Dreyfus [3], extended the above procedure to cases where the state-variable constraint was of order $p \geq 1$.[†] To ensure feasibility of the resulting trajectory, they adjoined a point equality constraint, consisting of the state constraint and its $(p - 1)$ time-derivatives, at the time of entry of the trajectory onto the constraint boundary. Their results reduce to those of Gamkrelidze and Berkovitz for the case of a first order constraint.

Chang [4], in 1962, used an entirely different approach. He adjoined the constraint violation to the cost functional by a penalty parameter and used a limiting procedure to obtain the necessary conditions directly. His proofs were limited to the first order case ($p = 1$). Dreyfus, in his book [5], clarified this direct procedure of adjoining the state-variable constraint per se, and obtained the same necessary conditions. Speyer [6] pointed out that Dreyfus' arguments failed for constraints of order $p > 1$, as then the adjoining multiplier may exhibit impulsive behavior. Dreyfus suggested the resolution of this matter as a research problem.

[†] The constraint is assumed to be of p -th order, i.e. the p -th time-derivative of the constraint is the first to contain the control variable explicitly.

Speyer [7] extended the direct approach to constraints of higher order, by adjoining directly the state-variable constraint to the cost functional, together with point equality constraints at junctions of boundary and interior arcs. He obtained a set of necessary conditions which differed from, but were related to, those obtained in [3]. McIntyre and Paiewonsky [8] used a similar approach.

A third set of necessary conditions, differing considerably in form from those in [3] and [7] were obtained by Dreyfus in his Ph.D. thesis [9]. He used the constraint and its $p-1$ time-derivatives to reduce, by p , the dimension of the state space along the constraint boundary. These results were related to those of [2] by Berkovitz and Dreyfus [10], for the case $p = 1$. Speyer has shown that these are related to the necessary conditions derived in [7].

Concurrently with these theoretical investigations, research was progressing on numerical methods for the solution of state variable inequality constrained problems. Denham and Bryson [11] used the results of [3] for a steepest ascent algorithm. Speyer [7] proposed a second order sweep algorithm. In 1962, Kelley [12] contributed by extending a device of Courant [13] to obtain a penalty function technique for the numerical solution of such problems. Other penalty procedures have been investigated by Lasdon, Waren and Rice [14], and Thrasher [26]. Kelley's procedure adjoins the square of the constraint violation to the cost by means of a penalty parameter; the resulting unconstrained problem is solved repeatedly for successively increasing penalty parameter values. The convergence of this type of procedure has been discussed by Butler and Martin [15], Russell [16], Lele and Jacobson [17], Cullum [18], and Beltrami [19]. Beltrami derived the generalized Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions in a Hilbert space by investigating further the limiting behavior of the penalty method.

In this paper, following Chang and Beltrami we derive necessary conditions of optimality from the limiting form of the Kelley penalty function technique. This yields necessary conditions of optimality which are similar to those of Speyer [7], except at the junction points of boundary and interior arcs. At these points the influence functions exhibit fewer discontinuities than predicted in [7]. (The same result can be obtained from the Lasdon, Waren and Rice procedure [14].) This is confirmed, under weaker assumptions, with the aid of the generalized Kuhn-Tucker conditions. We show the relationship of our results to those of [3] and [7]. In particular, we demonstrate that Speyer's necessary conditions are identical to ours provided that all, except possibly one, of the multipliers adjoining the point constraint at the junction are zero. This leads us to the conclusion that, in addition to Speyer's stated conditions, it is necessary that all his entry and exit point adjoining multipliers be zero except, possibly, the first.

The necessary conditions of [3] can be derived directly, by integration by parts, from ours; this derivation indicates that it is necessary that certain relationships hold between the entry (or exit) point multipliers.

Note that for the case where $p = 1$, and for $p = 2$ if the Hamiltonian is regular, our results are equivalent to the above [7] known necessary conditions, since there is then only one adjoining multiplier at entry and exit points. We use a fourth order constrained problem to illustrate that the existing necessary conditions of Bryson, Denham, and Dreyfus and Speyer, can be satisfied by a non-extremal (i. e. non-stationary trajectory) and thus can yield an incorrect answer. In the particular example considered, a trajectory consisting of boundary and interior arcs is pieced together; this satisfies the existing necessary conditions [3] and [7]. However, it turns out that the unconstrained optimal trajectory is at all times feasible and yields a lower value of the cost.

The problem was deliberately chosen to be convex so that no stationary but non-optimal solutions exist. This confirms that the necessary conditions of Bryson, Denham and Dreyfus and Speyer can be satisfied by a non-extremal.

In our necessary conditions the influence functions may exhibit discontinuities at junction points of boundary and interior arcs only along the direction S_x .[†] For problems where the Hamiltonian is regular, yielding a continuous optimal control function of time [8], we are able to derive a particularly simple expression for the magnitude of this discontinuity. The form of this expression leads us to conclude that, in certain cases, problems with state constraints of odd order (where $p > 1$) will not exhibit any boundary arcs over non-zero intervals of time; i. e. the trajectory will, at most, only touch the constraint boundary but will not lie along it. This behavior is illustrated by a third order example which is solved analytically. As predicted by the theory, the constrained trajectories do not remain on the boundary for non-zero intervals of time.

In summary, we have, by directly adjoining the state variable constraint to the cost functional, obtained necessary conditions of optimality that are considerably simpler and 'sharper' (in that non-extremals cannot satisfy them) than those of [3]-[11]. Furthermore, we are able to prove that under certain conditions, problems with constraints of odd order ($p > 1$) cannot contain boundary arcs of non-zero length.

2. Preliminaries

We first state the basic problem to be considered and establish some notation.

[†] $S(x(t)) \leq 0$, $t \in [0, T]$ is the state-variable inequality constraint. $S_x = \frac{\partial S}{\partial x}(x(t))$.

The following problem will be referred to as 'the basic problem' or 'problem (I)'.

Problem (I)

$$\underset{u}{\text{Minimize}} \Phi(x(T)) \quad (1)$$

subject to

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t)) \quad ; \quad x(0) = x_0 \quad (2)$$

and the scalar state-variable inequality constraint

$$S(x(t)) \leq 0 \quad ; \quad t \in [0, T] \quad (3)$$

Here,

$u(t)$ -- scalar control variable

$x(t)$ -- n-dimensional vector of state-variables

f -- n-dimensional vector function

S -- p-th order state-variable constraint

Φ -- scalar function of terminal value of state-variable

x_0 -- initial value of state vector, assumed known

\cdot -- $\frac{d}{dt} (\)$

$\left(\begin{smallmatrix} p \\ \cdot \end{smallmatrix} \right)$ -- $\frac{d^p}{dt^p} (\)$

$\| \cdot \|$ -- norm over the space under consideration

\ni -- such that

\in -- belonging to

\forall -- for all

\exists -- there exists

Assumptions

1. $u \in L_1[0, T] \equiv U$

2. $x \in C_1^n[0, T] \equiv X$

3. f is a continuous function of x and u and has bounded partial derivatives up to p -th order in both x and u on the interval $[0, T]$.
4. Φ is a continuous and differentiable function of $x(T)$.
5. $S \in C_p[0, T]$.
6. The basic problem has a feasible solution with finite cost v_0 .

Notes

1. The basic problem is of the form of Mayer. However there is no loss of generality, for a problem in the form of Lagrange or Bolza can always be cast into the form of Mayer by defining an additional state-variable.
2. u and S are assumed to be scalars for simplicity, without loss of generality.
3. f , S , and Φ are assumed to be implicit functions of time, without any loss of generality.

3. Summary of previous results

We shall summarize only the results of [3] and [7], as these are the closest in form to ours.

3.1. Necessary conditions of Bryson, Denham and Dreyfus

In [3] Bryson, Denham and Dreyfus extended the approach of [1] and [2] to problems with state constraints of orders higher than the first.[†] They differentiated

$$S(x(t))$$

p times with respect to time to obtain the mixed control-state inequality constraint

$${}^p(S)(x(t), u(t)) \leq 0 \quad . \quad (4)$$

They then transformed problem (I) into a control-constrained problem by applying the constraint (4) along boundary arcs. To ensure feasibility of the resulting trajectories they also imposed the following equality constraint

[†] See also [27].

at points of entry[†] of the trajectory onto the constraint boundary

$$\Psi(t_{\text{entry}}) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} S(x(t)) \\ \dot{S}(x(t)) \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ (S)(x(t)) \end{pmatrix}_{t=t_{\text{entry}}} = 0 \quad (5)$$

Thus the single state constraint (3) was replaced by the point constraint (5) at entry points and the control inequality constraint (4) along the boundary ($S = 0$). The equivalent problem was

$$\text{Minimize } \Phi(x(T)) \quad (6)$$

u

subject to

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t)) \quad ; \quad x(0) = x_0$$

and

$$\Psi(t_{\text{entry}}) = 0$$

$$\begin{matrix} P \\ (S)(x(t), u(t)) \leq 0 \end{matrix}, \quad t \in [t_{\text{entry}}, t_{\text{exit}}]$$

Adjoining (4) and (5) to (6) by a scalar multiplier function $\gamma(\cdot)$ (≥ 0) and vectors of multipliers, $v_b(t_i)$ (≥ 0) $i = 1, \dots, N$ -- corresponding to the N entry points -- they obtained the following necessary conditions

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u} = 0 = \gamma(S)_u + f_u^T \lambda \quad (7)$$

and the adjoint equations

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\dot{\lambda} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \\ &= f_x^T \lambda + \gamma(S)_x \end{aligned} \right\} \lambda(T) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} \Big|_{t=T} \quad (8)$$

where the Hamiltonian H was defined as

$$H = \gamma(S) + \lambda^T f \quad (9)$$

[†] This equality constraint could equally well be imposed at the points of exit from the boundary.

Due to the point constraints (5), the influence functions $\lambda(\cdot)$ suffer discontinuities of the form:

$$\lambda(t_i^+) = \lambda(t_i^-) - \nu_b^T(t_i) \left(\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x} \right)_{t_i} \quad (10)$$

at $t = t_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$), the entry points.

3.2. Speyer's necessary conditions

Speyer [7] adjoins the state-variable constraint directly to the cost functional with a multiplier function $\mu(\cdot)$ (≥ 0). To ensure feasibility, he also adjoins the point constraint (5) both at entry and exit points of boundary arcs with multipliers $\nu_S(t_i)$ (≥ 0). He obtains the following set of necessary conditions:

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u} = 0 = f_u^T \lambda \quad (11)$$

and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\dot{\lambda} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \\ &= f_x^T \lambda + \mu S_x \end{aligned} \right\} \lambda(T) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} \Big|_T \quad (12)$$

where the Hamiltonian H is

$$H = \mu S + \lambda^T f \quad (13)$$

At junction points of interior and boundary arcs, the adjoint variables suffer discontinuities; the boundary conditions are

$$\lambda(t_i^+) = \lambda(t_i^-) - \nu_S^T(t_i) \left(\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x} \right)_{t_i} \quad (14)$$

$i = 1, \dots, M$.

Speyer notes that, in going from an interior arc to a boundary arc, the jumps in $\lambda(\cdot)$ can be obtained as functions of $\lambda(\cdot)$ and $x(\cdot)$ immediately prior to the junction. Thus there are no more unknowns in his procedure than in the previous scheme [3].

4. Derivation of necessary conditions via the Kelley penalty function technique

The Kelley penalty function technique [12] converts the basic constrained problem (I) into the following unconstrained problem.

$$\underset{u}{\text{Minimize}} P(r_k) \equiv \Phi(x(T)) + \frac{1}{2} r_k^{-1} \int_0^T h(S) S^2 dt \quad (15)$$

subject to

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t)) \quad ; \quad x(0) = x_0 \quad (16)$$

where

$$h(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & a > 0 \\ 0 & a \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

and $r_k > 0$.

This problem is then solved repeatedly for an infinite sequence $\{r_k\}$ such that $r_k > r_{k+1} > 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} r_k = 0$. Lele and Jacobson [16] have shown that, under certain conditions, the above procedure converges. We state their main theorem below, with a slight modification.

Theorem 1. Let $\{r_k\}$ be an infinite sequence of positive numbers $\ni r_k > r_{k+1} > 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} r_k = 0$. Under certain conditions[†], the P-function is minimized by a bounded control function u_k (not necessarily unique); further, every limit point of the sequence of control functions $\{u_k\}$ solves the problem (I).

Here u_k denotes the optimal control for the k-th problem, i.e. the unconstrained problem corresponding to the k-th member of the sequence $\{r_k\}$. Let us now examine the necessary conditions of optimality for this, unconstrained, problem. Defining the Hamiltonian H_k as

$$H_k \equiv \frac{1}{2} r_k^{-1} h(S) S^2 + \lambda^T f \quad (18)$$

[†] See [17] p. 165.

the necessary conditions of optimality are

$$\frac{\partial H_k}{\partial u} = 0 = f_u^T \lambda \quad (19)$$

and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\dot{\lambda} &= \frac{\partial H_k}{\partial x} \\ &= f_x^T \lambda + r_k^{-1} h(S) S_x S_x \end{aligned} \right\} \lambda(T) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} \Big|_T \quad (20)$$

If we denote the term $r_k^{-1} h(S) S$ by η_k , (20) may be re-written as

$$-\dot{\lambda} = f_x^T \lambda + \eta_k S_x \quad (21)$$

We can now derive the necessary conditions of optimality for problem (I) by considering the equations (18), (19) and (21) in the limit as $r_k \rightarrow 0^+$. For this purpose consider only the limit

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k(\cdot) \equiv \eta(\cdot) \quad (22)$$

Beltrami [19] has shown that, under certain additional restrictions on Φ , S and U , the above limit exists and is bounded. His proof is stated for the case when S maps X to E_1^1 . It can be readily extended to the present case, with the essential change that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k(t) \equiv \eta(t) < \text{constant a.e.} \quad (23)$$

This gives the following necessary conditions of optimality

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u} = 0 = f_u^T \lambda \quad (24)$$

and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\dot{\lambda} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \\ &= f_x^T \lambda + \eta S_x \end{aligned} \right\} \lambda(T) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} \Big|_T \quad (25)$$

[†] Chang [4] uses a similar approach. An alternative, rigorous derivation is given in Section 5.

where $\eta(\cdot) \geq 0$ and we have defined H as

$$H \equiv \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} H_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\eta_k S + \lambda^T f) \quad (26)$$

From (23), it follows that the function $\eta(\cdot)$ may contain impulses of positive weight. This would lead to discontinuities in the influence functions of the form

$$\lambda(t_1^+) = \lambda(t_1^-) - \nu \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)_{t_1} \quad (27)$$

where $t_1 \in [0, T]$ is the time at which the impulse occurs and $\nu \geq 0$ is a scalar.

Equations (24)-(27) form the necessary conditions for problem (I). As can be seen, (27) is considerably different from either (10) or (14), which give the existing form of the discontinuities. In the next section, we derive the above necessary conditions directly and rigorously, and we show that the discontinuities in the influence functions occur at the junctions between boundary and interior arcs.

5. A direct derivation of the necessary conditions

We present below an alternative derivation of the necessary conditions of optimality, (24)-(27). Basically we rederive the generalized Kuhn-Tucker conditions [20] in a Banach space. Russell [21] has previously derived these conditions in a general topological space and applied them to a state constrained problem. Luenberger [22] has obtained similar results. However, these researchers have not related their work to that of [3], [7].

Our proof, in Section 5.1, follows closely that in [22], with the essential difference of no qualification on the constraint. This admits the possibility of an unbounded multiplier. After translating the necessary conditions to state space in Section 5.2, in Section 5.3 we prove the boundedness of the multiplier under a different qualification, more natural from the control-theoretic point of view.

5.1. A generalized Kuhn-Tucker Theorem

For the purposes of this section we write the basic problem in the form

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize } \Phi(u) \\ u \end{array} \quad (28)$$

subject to

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} S(u) \leq \theta \\ u \in U \end{array} \right\} \quad (\text{II})$$

Here θ denotes the null vector in $C_p[0, T]$. We will now consider necessary conditions of optimality for this problem.

All differentials and derivatives will be in the sense of Fréchet. The symbol $\langle x, T \rangle$ will denote the value of the linear functional $T(x)$ at a point $x \in X$. (cf [23] p. 21.)

Theorem 2. Let Φ be a real valued Fréchet differentiable function on U , and $S: U \rightarrow C_p[0, T]$ a Fréchet differentiable mapping. Suppose $u^* \in U$ minimizes Φ subject to $S(u^*) \leq \theta$. Then there exists $r_0 \geq 0$, $\eta^* \in L_\infty[0, T]$, $\eta^* \geq \theta$, such that the Lagrangian

$$r_0 \Phi(u) + \langle S(u), \eta^* \rangle \quad (29)$$

is stationary at u^* . Further

$$\langle S(u^*), \eta^* \rangle = 0 \quad (30)$$

Proof. Define the following sets, A and B , on $W = R \times C_p[0, T]$.

$$\begin{aligned} A \equiv \{r, z \mid r \geq \delta \Phi(u^*; \delta u), z \geq S(u^*) + \delta S(u^*; \delta u) \\ \text{for some } \delta u \in U\} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

and

$$B \equiv \{r, z \mid r \leq 0, z \leq \theta\} \quad (32)$$

The sets A and B are convex; B contains interior points as $C_p[0, T]$ has positive cone.

Denote by $\text{Int}(B)$ the interior of B . Then

$$A \cap \text{Int}(B) = \emptyset \quad (33)$$

the empty set. For, if $(r, z) \in A \ni r < 0, z < \theta$, then $\exists \delta u \in U \ni$

$$\delta \Phi(u^*; \delta u) < 0, \quad S(u^*) + \delta S(u^*; \delta u) < \theta \quad (34)$$

Then \exists a sphere of radius ρ centered on $S(u^*) + \delta S(u^*; \delta u) \subseteq N$ (the negative cone in $C_p[0, T]$). For $0 < \alpha < 1$ the point $\alpha[S(u^*) + \delta S(u^*; \delta u)]$ is the center of an open sphere of radius $\alpha \cdot \rho$ contained in N ; hence so is the point

$$(1 - \alpha)S(u^*) + \alpha[S(u^*) + \delta S(u^*; \delta u)] = S(u^*) + \alpha \cdot \delta S(u^*; \delta u). \quad \text{As for fixed } \delta u$$

$$\|S(u^* + \alpha \delta u) - S(u^*) - \alpha \cdot \delta S(u^*; \delta u)\| = o(\alpha) \quad (35)$$

it follows that for sufficiently small α , $S(u^* + \alpha \delta u) < \theta$. A similar argument shows that $\Phi(u^* + \alpha \delta u) < \Phi(u^*)$ for sufficiently small α . This contradicts the optimality of u^* . Therefore

$$A \cap \text{Int}(B) = \emptyset.$$

So A and B are two convex sets in the normed space $R \times C_p[0, T]$ such that $A \cap \text{Int}(B) = \emptyset$ and $\text{Int}(B) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore \exists a closed hyperplane separating A and B , [24]. Hence $\exists r_0, \eta^*, \delta$ such that

$$r_0 \cdot r + \langle z, \eta^* \rangle \geq \delta \quad \forall (r, z) \in A \quad (36)$$

and

$$r_0 \cdot r + \langle z, \eta^* \rangle \leq \delta \quad \forall (r, z) \in B \quad (37)$$

As $(0, \theta) \in A \cap B$, $\delta = 0$; and from the nature of B it follows that $r_0 \geq 0$, $\eta^* \geq \theta$. From the separation property

$$r_0 \cdot \delta \Phi(u^*; \delta u) + \langle S(u^*) + \delta S(u^*; \delta u), \eta^* \rangle \geq 0 \quad (38)$$

$\forall \delta u \in U$.

From the above inequality, $\delta u = \theta \implies \langle S(u^*), \eta^* \rangle \geq 0$; but $S(u^*) \leq \theta$ and $\eta^* \geq \theta \implies \langle S(u^*), \eta^* \rangle \leq 0$, hence

$$\langle S(u^*), \eta^* \rangle = 0 \quad (39)$$

It then follows that $\forall \delta u \in U$

$$r_o \delta \Phi(u^*; \delta u) + \langle \delta S(u^*; \delta u); \eta^* \rangle = 0 \quad (40)$$

i. e.

$$r_o \Phi_{u^*} + \eta^* S_{u^*} = 0 \quad (41)$$

where Φ_{u^*} , S_{u^*} denote the Fréchet derivatives of Φ and S evaluated at u^* .

We will now translate these results into the more familiar state space form.

5.2. The stationarity conditions in state space

In state space, the equivalent of the Lagrangian of (29) is the adjoined cost functional

$$\bar{J} \equiv r_o \Phi(x(T)) + \int_0^T dt [\eta^*(t) S(x(t)) + \lambda(t)(f(x(t), u(t)) - \dot{x}(t))] \quad (42)$$

Then following the usual procedure [27] we consider variations in \bar{J} for arbitrary variations δx , δu . This gives the following conditions for stationarity of \bar{J} :

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\dot{\lambda} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \\ &= f_x^T \lambda + \eta^* S_x \end{aligned} \right\} \lambda(T) = r_o \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} \Big|_T \quad (43)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u} = 0 = f_u^T \lambda \quad (44)$$

where the Hamiltonian H is

$$H = \eta^* S + \lambda^T f \quad (45)$$

and from (30)

$$\eta^*(t) = \begin{cases} \geq 0 & S(x(t)) = 0 \\ 0 & S(x(t)) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

From Section 5.1, these are the necessary conditions that a control u^* and its associated trajectory x^* satisfy if they solve (I).

5.3. Boundedness of the adjoining multiplier

Theorem 3. If $\frac{\partial}{\partial u(t)} [(S)(x^*(t), u^*(t))] \neq 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$ then $r_0 \neq 0$.

Proof. For clarity, and without any loss of generality we will assume that the optimal trajectory x^* has only one boundary arc and two interior arcs.

Suppose $r_0 = 0$. Then $\lambda(T) = 0$ (from (43)); hence

$$\lambda(t) = 0 \quad t \in (t_{\text{ex}}, T] \quad (47)$$

where t_{ex} = time of exit from boundary arc. From (44), $\forall t \in [0, T]$

$$H_u = 0 \quad (48)$$

hence

$$\begin{cases} \dot{(H_u)} = 0 \\ \vdots \\ \dot{(H_u)}^{p-1} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

and similarly for higher derivatives of H_u . In particular, at $t = t_{\text{ex}}$

$$\begin{cases} (H_u)^- = (H_u)^+ \\ \dot{(H_u)}^- = \dot{(H_u)}^+ \\ \vdots \\ (H_u)^{p-1-} = (H_u)^{p-1+} \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

where the - and + superscripts denote instants just prior to, and just after t_{ex} , respectively. From (43), we have that

$$\lambda(t_{\text{ex}}^-) = \lambda(t_{\text{ex}}^+) + \int_{t_{\text{ex}}^+}^{t_{\text{ex}}^-} \eta^*(t) S_x(x(t)) dt \quad (51)$$

which substituted into

$$(H_u)^{p-1-} = (H_u)^{p-1+}$$

yields, after some manipulation (since $\lambda(t) = 0$; $t \in (t_{\text{ex}}, T]$)

$$\int_{t_{\text{ex}}^+}^{t_{\text{ex}}^-} \eta^*(S)_u^p dt = 0 \quad (52)$$

As, by assumption $(S)_u^p \neq 0$, $\eta^*(t_{ex}^-) < \infty$. This gives $\lambda(t_{ex}^-) = 0$. Now, from

$$(H_u^p) = 0 \quad (53)$$

along $S = 0$ we have

$$\eta^*(t) = \frac{[\text{terms involving } (f_u^{p-1}) \text{ etc}] \lambda(t)}{(S)_u^p} \quad (54)$$

This gives a linear homogeneous differential equation for $\lambda(\cdot)$ along $S = 0$, with the initial condition $\lambda(t_{ex}^-) = 0$. Hence $\lambda(\cdot) = 0$ along the boundary.

Thus,

$$\eta^*(\cdot) = 0 \quad \text{a.e.} \quad (55)$$

as well as $r_o = 0$. But $r_o = 0$, $\eta^* = 0$ contradicts the fact that \exists a closed separating hyperplane (Section 5.1). Thus $r_o \neq 0$.

For convenience we set $r_o = 1$. We now show that η^* is bounded everywhere except possibly at junction points of boundary and interior arcs.

Theorem 4. The multiplier η^* is bounded everywhere along the boundary, except possibly at junction points of boundary and interior arcs. At such a junction point, it may exhibit a positive impulse of finite strength.

Proof. As in Theorem 3, we will assume, without loss of generality, that x^* has only one boundary arc and two interior arcs.

From (54), $\eta^*(\cdot)$ along the boundary is given by

$$\eta^*(t) = \frac{[\text{terms involving } (f_u^{p-1}) \text{ etc}] \lambda(t)}{(S)_u^p} \quad (56)$$

Denote by t_1 , the time of a junction between the boundary arc and an interior arc; superscripts $-$ and $+$ denote times prior to and after the junction, respectively. Then from (43)

$$\lambda(t_1^+) = \lambda(t_1^-) - \int_{t_1^-}^{t_1^+} \eta^* S_x dt \quad (57)$$

$(\lambda(t_1^-))$ is assumed bounded[†].

This coupled with (55), (43) and

$$(H_u)^{-1} = (H_u)^{+1} \quad (58)$$

leads to the conclusion that

$$\int_{t_1^-}^{t_1^+} \eta^*(S)_u^p dt \quad \text{unbounded} \implies \eta^*(\cdot) \text{ unbounded.} \quad (59)$$

everywhere, which contradicts the fact that \exists a closed hyperplane in Theorem 2.

Hence

$$\int_{t_1^-}^{t_1^+} \eta^*(S)_u^p dt < \infty$$

and thus $\lambda(t_1^-)$ is bounded and hence $\lambda(t)$ is bounded along $S = 0$, so that

$$\eta^*(\cdot) < \infty \quad (60)$$

with the possible exception of junction points, where it may exhibit positive impulses ($\eta^* \geq 0$) of finite strength.

This last possibility is conveniently summarized by adding the following junction condition to the necessary conditions (43), (44):

$$\lambda(t_1^+) = \lambda(t_1^-) - \psi(t_1) \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)_{t_1} \quad (61)$$

where t_1 is the time of the junction.

5.4. The necessary conditions summarized

We summarize below the necessary conditions derived in this section.

Theorem 5. The necessary conditions for optimality of problem (I) are

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u} = 0 = f_u^T \lambda \quad (62)$$

[†] A reasonable assumption.

$$\left. \begin{aligned} -\dot{\lambda} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \\ &= f_x^T \lambda + \hat{\eta} S_x \end{aligned} \right\} \lambda(T) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} \Big|_T \quad (63)$$

where

$$\hat{\eta}(t) = \begin{cases} \geq 0 & S(x(t)) = 0 \\ 0 & S(x(t)) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (64)$$

is a bounded function for $t \in [0, T]$.

At junction points t_i of boundary and interior arcs, the influence functions $\lambda(\cdot)$ may be discontinuous. The boundary conditions are

$$\lambda(t_i^+) = \lambda(t_i^-) - \nu(t_i) \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)_{t_i} \quad (65)$$

$\nu(t_i) \geq 0$. The Hamiltonian H , used above, is defined by

$$H \equiv \hat{\eta} S + \lambda^T f \quad (66)$$

5.5. Generalization

For the case where $S \in C_p^r[0, T]$, the necessary conditions are the same as those above, but $\hat{\eta}(\cdot)$ and ν are r -vectors. If terminal equality constraints $(\psi(x(t_f), t_f) = 0)$ are present, then the necessary conditions take the following form:

Theorem 6. (Equality Terminal Constraints) If in addition to the assumptions of Section 5, the following are true

$$i) \quad \delta \dot{x} = f_x(x^*(t), u^*(t)) \delta x + f_u(x^*(t), u^*(t)) \delta u$$

is completely controllable

$$ii) \quad \psi_x(x^*(t_f), t_f) \text{ has rank } q \text{ } (\psi \text{ is a } q\text{-vector function})$$

then necessary conditions of optimality are:

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u} = 0 = f_u^T \lambda \quad (67)$$

$$-\dot{\lambda} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} = f_x^T \lambda + \hat{\eta} S_x \quad ; \quad \lambda(T) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} + \sigma^T \psi_x \Big|_T \quad (68)$$

σ is a q -vector of constant Lagrange multipliers and

$$\hat{\eta}(t) = \begin{cases} \geq 0 & S(x(t)) = 0 \\ 0 & S(x(t)) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

At junction points of boundary and interior arcs:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda(t_i^+) = \lambda(t_i^-) - \nu(t_i) \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right)_{t_i} & i = 1, \dots, N \\ \nu(t_i) \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

Proof. We only sketch the proof here. The above problem may be considered in the following nonlinear programming formulation

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Min } \Phi(u) \\ & u \end{aligned}$$

subject to

$$S(u) \leq 0$$

$$\psi(u) = 0$$

Assumptions i), ii) above imply that ψ is regular at u^* .

Define the set

$$U_1 \equiv \{u : \psi_u(u^*)\delta u = 0, u^* + \delta u \in U\} \quad (71)$$

The set A (Theorem 2) is now defined as

$$A \equiv \{(r, z) : r \geq \delta f(u^*; \delta u), z \geq S(u^*) + \delta S(u^*; \delta u); \text{ for some } \delta u \in U_1\} \quad (72)$$

Using similar though more involved arguments than those of Theorem 2 it follows, since ψ is regular at u^* , that

$$\langle r_0 \Phi_u + \eta^* S_u, \delta u \rangle = 0 \quad \delta u \in U_1 \quad (73)$$

This leads to the conclusion

$$r_0 \Phi_u + \eta^* S_u + \sigma^T \psi_u = 0 \quad (74)$$

Translating back into state space and using the assumption $\frac{\partial}{\partial u(t)} (S) \neq 0$;

$t \in [0, T]$ yields the necessary conditions (67)-(70).

6. Relation to previous results

6.1. Bryson, Denham and Dreyfus

Let us rewrite (42) as the following (noting that $r_o = 1$)

$$\underset{u}{\text{Minimize } J} \equiv \Phi(x(T)) + \int_0^T d\tau \eta(\tau) S(x(\tau)) \quad (75)$$

subject to

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t)) \quad ; \quad x(0) = x_o \quad (76)$$

where we have written η for η^* . For simplicity, and with no loss of generality, we will assume that the optimal trajectory has only one constrained arc.

Then integrating the cost functional by parts, equation (75) becomes (dropping the Min operator for simplicity),

$$\Phi(x(\tau), T) + [\eta_1(\tau) S(x(\tau))] \Big|_{t=t_{en}}^{t=t_{ex}} - \int_0^T d\tau \eta_1(\tau) \frac{d}{d\tau} [S(x(\tau))] \quad (77)$$

where

$$\eta_1(t) = \int_0^t \eta(\tau) d\tau \quad (78)$$

Adding and subtracting $\eta_1(t_{ex}) S(t_{ex})$, (77) becomes[†]

$$\Phi(x(\tau), T) + \nu_1 S(x) \Big|_{t=t_{en}} + \int_0^T \bar{\eta}_1(\tau) \frac{d}{d\tau} [S(x(\tau))] \quad (79)$$

where

$$\nu_1 \equiv \eta_1(t_{ex}) - \eta_1(t_{en}) \geq 0 \quad (80)$$

and

$$\bar{\eta}_1(t) = \eta_1(t_{ex}) - \eta_1(t) \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_{en}, t_{ex}] \quad (81)$$

[†] Note that $\int_0^T \eta(\tau) S(x(\tau)) d\tau \equiv \int_{t_{en}}^{t_{ex}} d\tau \eta S$

We can carry on this process of integration by parts until finally we obtain

$$J = \Phi(x(\tau), T) + v^T \Psi + \int_0^T \bar{\eta}_p(\tau) \frac{d^p}{d\tau^p} [S(x(\tau))] d\tau \quad (82)$$

where

$$\Psi^T = (S, \dot{S}, \ddot{S}, \dots, (S)^{p-1}) \quad (83)$$

and

$$v^T = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p] \quad (84)$$

and

$$v_i = \eta_i(t_{ex}) - \eta_i(t_{en}) \geq 0 \quad (85)$$

and

$$\bar{\eta}_p(t) = \eta_p(t_{ex}) - \eta_p(t) \quad (86)$$

and where

$$\eta_i(t) = \int_0^t \bar{\eta}_{i-1}(\tau) d\tau \quad (86)$$

and

$$\bar{\eta}_i(t) = \eta_i(t_{ex}) - \eta_i(t) \geq 0 \quad (88)$$

Identifying $\eta_p(\cdot)$ with $\gamma(\cdot)$ we see that (82) is equivalent to the adjoined cost functional of [3]. If we now use (82) as the functional to be minimized subject to equation (76) we obtain the same stationarity conditions as those given by equations (8)-(10). The noteworthy point is the set of equations (85)-(88). These indicate that the v 's and $\gamma(t)$ of [3] are related along the optimal trajectory.

6.2. Relation to Speyer's necessary conditions

Speyer's [7] necessary conditions reduce to those given by us, if his multipliers v_{S_2} through v_{S_p} are zero. For, if that is the case, (14) and (65) are the same, and setting $\mu(\cdot)$ equal to $\hat{\eta}(\cdot)$ completes the connection.

The fact that, along an extremal Speyer's multipliers v_{S_2} through v_{S_p} are zero leads to an interesting result, provided the Hamiltonian (66) has a unique minimum in $u(\cdot)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, i. e. if the Hamiltonian is regular. In this case, Speyer [7] and McIntyre and Paiewonsky [8] have shown that $u(\cdot)$ must be continuous across the junction, and that $v_{S_p} = 0$. But if $v_{S_{p-2}}, v_{S_{p-1}}, v_{S_{p-2}}, v_{S_2}$ are all zero, then u and all its derivatives up to (u) must be continuous across the junction. This result is easily obtained from [7] or equations (14) and (50).

7. A further consequence of the new necessary conditions

For the regular case, where, from the preceding discussion, u and its $(p-2)$ time derivatives are continuous we have:

Theorem 7. If the Hamiltonian H is regular, $S \in B_{2p-1}[0, T]^+$ and the extremal path has a boundary arc of non-zero length, then

$$v(t_1) = (-1)^p \frac{H_{uu}^- [(u)^- - (u)^+]^2}{2p-1 (S)^-} \geq 0 \quad (89)$$

where $()^-$ denotes $()$ on the interior arc at the junction time t_1 .

Proof. We use (65) and

$$(H_u)^- = (H_u)^+ \quad (90)$$

which holds across a junction; noting that

$$\begin{aligned} (H_u)^- &= \frac{d^{p-1}}{dt^{p-1}} (f_u^T \lambda) \\ &= f_{uu}^T \lambda^{p-1}(u) + \text{terms of lower order time derivatives of } u \\ &\quad + \text{terms in } f_u f_x \text{ etc.} \end{aligned}$$

$^+ B_{2p-1} \equiv$ space of all functions whose $(2p-1)$ th derivatives exist and are bounded.

we have the following expression for $v(t_1)$ (after simplifying it with the aid of (65) and the above expression for $(H_u)^{p-1}$):

$$v(t_1) = \frac{(-1)^p (f_{uu}^T)^+ \lambda^- [(u)^{p-1} - (u)^{p-1}]}{(S)_u^+} \quad (91)$$

As $S \in B_{2p-1}[0, T]$ by assumption, we have, from the general expression

$$(S)^{2p-1} = (S)_u^p (u)^{p-1} + \text{lower order time derivatives of } u + \text{terms in } f, (\dot{f}) \text{ etc.}$$

the relation

$$(S)^{2p-1} - (S)^{2p-1} = (S)_u^p [(u)^{p-1} - (u)^{p-1}]$$

whence, $+$

$$v(t_1) = \frac{(-1)^p (H_{uu})^- [(u)^{p-1} - (u)^{p-1}]^2}{(S)^{2p-1}} \quad (92)$$

This expression for $v(t_1)$ is very significant. Note that $H_{uu} > 0$ (strengthened necessary condition for a minimum), $[(u)^{p-1} - (u)^{p-1}]^2 \geq 0$ and as S and its time derivatives up to $(S)^{2p-2}$ are continuous (therefore zero)

$$(S)^{2p-1} > 0$$

for the trajectory to reach the boundary. This implies that

$$v(t_1) \leq 0 \quad (93)$$

for p odd. But $v(t_1) \geq 0$ and hence (93) implies that for odd order constraints the trajectory will, at most, only touch the boundary, if $(u)^{p-1} \neq (u)^{p-1}$. Note that for $p = 1$, $u^- = u^+$, so that, from (91) $v(t_1) = 0$; thus for the first order case boundary arcs are permitted.

$+$ $(S)^{2p-1} = 0$ as S and all its time derivatives are zero along boundary.

This behavior and (92) are reminiscent of junction conditions in singular control problems. This provides a further hint of a close connection between state-constrained and singular control problems which has been suggested elsewhere [25].

8. A third order problem

Third and fourth order state constrained problems are illustrated. The third order problem confirms the result of Section 7, as all optimal trajectories do not stay on the constraint boundary for any nonzero length of time.

Consider the following problem:

$$\underset{u}{\text{Minimize}} \int_0^1 \frac{u^2}{2} dt \quad (94)$$

subject to

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = x_2 & x_1(0) = 0 = x_1(1) \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_3 & x_2(0) = 1 = -x_2(1) \\ \dot{x}_3 = u & x_3(0) = 2 = x_3(1) \end{cases} \quad (95)$$

and the constraint

$$x_1(t) - \ell \leq 0 \quad t \in [0, 1] \quad (96)$$

where ℓ ranges as

$$\frac{3}{8} \geq \ell \geq 0 \quad (97)$$

The solution to the unconstrained problem is obtained first. The Hamiltonian H is

$$H = \frac{u^2}{2} + \lambda_1 x_2 + \lambda_2 x_3 + \lambda_3 u \quad (98)$$

The adjoint equations are

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\lambda}_1 = 0 & \lambda_1(1) = \text{constant} \\ \dot{\lambda}_2 = -\lambda_1 & \lambda_2(1) = \text{constant} \\ \dot{\lambda}_3 = -\lambda_2 & \lambda_3(1) = \text{constant} \end{cases} \quad (99)$$

Minimizing the Hamiltonian gives the optimal control

$$H_u = 0 = u + \lambda_3 \Rightarrow u = -\lambda_3 \quad (100)$$

The solution to the problem is:

Optimal control is u^0

$$u^0 = 48(t - \frac{1}{2}) \quad (101)$$

Optimal trajectory

$$\begin{cases} x_1^0 = 2t^4 - 4t^3 + t^2 + t \\ x_2^0 = 8t^3 - 12t^2 + 2t + 1 \\ x_3^0 = 24t^2 - 24t + 2 \end{cases} \quad (102)$$

Adjoint variable histories

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1^0 = 0 \\ \lambda_2^0 = 48 \\ \lambda_3^0 = 48(\frac{1}{2} - t) \end{cases} \quad (103)$$

Note that the constraint is not effective for $\ell > \frac{3}{8}$.

The solution to the constrained problem consists of two parts.

For ℓ in the range $\frac{9}{40} < \ell \leq \frac{3}{8}$ there is only one point of contact with the constraint boundary at $t = \frac{1}{2}$. The complete solution is

$$u^0 = \begin{cases} at^2 + bt + c & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ -[a(1-t)^2 + b(1-t) + c] & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (104)$$

$$x_1^0 = \begin{cases} \frac{at^5}{60} + \frac{bt^4}{24} + \frac{ct^3}{6} + t^2 + t & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{a(1-t)^5}{60} + \frac{b(1-t)^4}{24} + \frac{c(1-t)^3}{6} + (1-t)^2 + (1-t) & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (105)$$

$$x_2^0 = \begin{cases} \frac{at^4}{12} + \frac{bt^3}{6} + \frac{ct^2}{2} + 2t + 1 & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ -[\frac{a(1-t)^4}{12} + \frac{b(1-t)^3}{6} + \frac{c(1-t)^2}{2} + 2(1-t) + 1] & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (106)$$

$$\begin{cases} x_3^0 = \frac{at^3}{3} + \frac{bt^2}{2} + ct + 2 & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{a(1-t)^3}{3} + \frac{b(1-t)^2}{2} + c(1-t) + 2 & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (107)$$

and the adjoint variable history is

$$\lambda_1 = \begin{cases} -2a & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 2a & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (108)$$

$$\lambda_2 = \begin{cases} 2at + b & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 2a(1-t) + b & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (109)$$

and

$$\lambda_3 = \begin{cases} -at^2 - bt - c & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ -a(1-t)^2 + b(1-t) + c & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (110)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} a = 5120(\ell - \frac{3}{8}) \\ b = -3200(\ell - \frac{39}{100}) \\ c = 320(\ell - \frac{9}{20}) \end{cases} \quad (111)$$

When $\ell < \frac{9}{40}$, the single point of contact splits into two, instead of a boundary arc as would occur for the same constraint on $x_2(1)$ [27]. The solution is a trifle more complicated and consists of four parts: one prior to the first point of contact with the constraint boundary at time t_1 ($< \frac{1}{2}$), one for $t \in [t_1, \frac{1}{2}]$, one for $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1 - t_1]$ and one for $t \in [1 - t_1, 1]$. The times of contact are symmetric about $t = \frac{1}{2}$.

The optimal control u is:

$$u = \begin{cases} at^2 + bt + c & 0 \leq t < t_1 \\ dt + e & t_1 < t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ -d(1-t) - e & \frac{1}{2} < t \leq 1 - t_1 \\ -a(1-t)^2 - b(1-t) - c & 1 - t_1 < t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (112)$$

The optimal trajectory is

$$x_1 = \begin{cases} \frac{at^5}{60} + \frac{bt^4}{24} + \frac{ct^3}{6} + t^2 + t & 0 \leq t \leq t_1 \\ \frac{dt^4}{24} + \frac{et^3}{6} + \frac{At^2}{2} + Bt + C & t_1 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{d(1-t)^4}{24} + \frac{e(1-t)^3}{6} + \frac{A(1-t)^2}{2} + B(1-t) + C & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 - t_1 \\ \frac{a(1-t)^5}{60} + \frac{b(1-t)^4}{24} + \frac{c(1-t)^3}{6} + (1-t)^2 + (1-t) & 1 - t_1 \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (113)$$

$$x_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{at^4}{12} + \frac{bt^3}{6} + \frac{ct^2}{2} + 2t + 1 & 0 \leq t \leq t_1 \\ \frac{dt^3}{6} + \frac{et^2}{2} + At + B & t_1 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{d(1-t)^3}{6} - \frac{e(1-t)^2}{2} - A(1-t) - B & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 - t_1 \\ -\frac{a(1-t)^4}{12} - \frac{b(1-t)^3}{6} - \frac{c(1-t)^2}{2} - 2(1-t) - 1 & 1 - t_1 \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (114)$$

and

$$x_3 = \begin{cases} \frac{at^3}{3} + \frac{bt^2}{2} + ct + 2 \\ \frac{dt^2}{2} + et + A \\ \frac{d(1-t)^2}{2} + e(1-t) + A \\ \frac{a(1-t)^3}{3} + \frac{b(1-t)^2}{2} + c(1-t) + 2 \end{cases} \quad (115)$$

where

$$A \equiv \frac{dt_1^3}{3} + \frac{bt_1^2}{2} + ct_1 + 2 - \frac{dt_1^2}{2} - et_1 \quad (116)$$

$$B \equiv \frac{dt_1^4}{12} + \frac{bt_1^3}{6} + \frac{ct_1^2}{2} + 2t_1 + 1 - \frac{dt_1^3}{6} - \frac{et_1^2}{2} - At_1 \quad (117)$$

and

$$C \equiv \frac{at_1^5}{60} + \frac{bt_1^4}{24} + \frac{ct_1^3}{6} + t_1^2 + t_1 - \frac{dt_1^4}{24} - \frac{et_1^3}{6} - \frac{At_1^2}{2} - Bt_1 \quad (118)$$

The adjoint variable histories are

$$\lambda_1 = \begin{cases} -2a & 0 \leq t \leq t_1 \\ 0 & t_1 \leq t \leq 1 - t_1 \\ 2a & 1 - t_1 \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (119)$$

$$\lambda_2 = \begin{cases} 2at + b & 0 \leq t \leq t_1 \\ d & t_1 \leq t \leq 1 - t_1 \\ +2a(1 - t) + b & 1 - t_1 \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (120)$$

and

$$\lambda_3 = \begin{cases} -at^2 - bt - c & 0 \leq t \leq t_1 \\ -dt - e & t_1 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ d(1 - t) + e & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1 - t_1 \\ a(1 - t)^2 + b(1 - t) + c & 1 - t_1 \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (121)$$

The constants a , b , c , d , e and t_1 are related to ℓ by the following set of equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} d + 2e = 0 \\ at_1^2 + bt_1 + e - dt_1 - e = 0 \\ \frac{d}{48} + \frac{e}{8} + \frac{A}{2} + B = 0 \\ \frac{dt_1^4}{12} + \frac{bt_1^3}{6} + \frac{ct_1^2}{2} + 2t_1 + 1 = 0 \\ \frac{dt_1^5}{60} + \frac{bt_1^4}{24} + \frac{ct_1^3}{6} + t_1^2 + t_1 = \ell \\ 2at_1 + b - d = 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (122)$$

The equations (122) were treated as a set of linear equations in a , b , c , d , e and ℓ , and solutions found for t_1 in the range $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$. The times of contact are plotted vs ℓ in Fig. 1 which shows $x_1(\cdot)$ for various values of ℓ . Fig. 2 shows the corresponding control history. It is worth noting that, as the Hamiltonian is regular, the control u is continuous, as also is \dot{u} but \ddot{u} is discontinuous at t_1 and $1 - t_1$. For this problem, $\hat{\eta}(\cdot) = 0$.

9. A fourth order problem

We have set up this problem to demonstrate that a nonextremal can satisfy the necessary conditions of Bryson, Denham and Dreyfus [3] and Speyer [7].

Consider the following fourth order problem

$$\text{Min}_u \int_0^{10} \frac{u^2}{2} dt \quad (123)$$

subject to

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = x_2 & x_1(0) = 0 = x_1(10) \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_3 & x_2(0) = -x_2(10) = \frac{15}{12} \\ \dot{x}_3 = x_4 & x_3(0) = x_3(10) = -\frac{15}{12} \\ \dot{x}_4 = u & x_4(0) = -x_4(10) = \frac{15}{16} \end{cases} \quad (124)$$

and the constraint

$$x_1(t) - 1 \leq 0 \quad t \in [0, 10] \quad (125)$$

The following trajectory, consisting of a boundary arc between $t = 4$ and $t = 6$ and two interior arcs satisfies all the necessary conditions given in [7].

$$u_1(t) = \begin{cases} -\frac{15}{128}(4 - t) & 0 \leq t \leq 4 \\ 0 & 4 \leq t \leq 6 \\ \frac{15}{128}(6 - t) & 6 \leq t \leq 10 \end{cases} \quad (126)$$




FIG. 1 THIRD ORDER PROBLEM $x_1(\cdot)$ vs. TIME




FIG. 2 THIRD ORDER PROBLEM $u(\cdot)$ vs. TIME

$$x_1(t) = \begin{cases} \ell - \frac{\alpha(4-t)^5}{120} & 0 \leq t \leq 4 \\ \ell & 4 \leq t \leq 6 \\ \ell + \frac{\alpha(6-t)^5}{120} & 6 \leq t \leq 10 \end{cases} \quad (127)$$

$$x_2(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha(4-t)^4}{24} & 0 \leq t \leq 4 \\ 0 & 4 \leq t \leq 6 \\ -\frac{\alpha(6-t)^4}{24} & 6 \leq t \leq 10 \end{cases} \quad (128)$$

$$x_3(t) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\alpha(4-t)^3}{6} & 0 \leq t \leq 4 \\ 0 & 4 \leq t \leq 6 \\ \frac{\alpha(6-t)^3}{6} & 6 \leq t \leq 10 \end{cases} \quad (129)$$

$$x_4(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha(4-t)^2}{2} & 0 \leq t \leq 4 \\ 0 & 4 \leq t \leq 6 \\ -\frac{\alpha(6-t)^2}{2} & 6 \leq t \leq 10 \end{cases} \quad (130)$$

where $\alpha = \frac{15}{128}$. The adjoint variables are

$$\lambda_1 = 0 \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right\} \quad 0 \leq t \leq 10 \quad (131)$$

$$\lambda_2 = 0 \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right\} \quad (132)$$

$$\lambda_3 = \begin{cases} \frac{15}{128} & 0 \leq t \leq 4 \\ 0 & 4 \leq t \leq 6 \\ -\frac{15}{128} & 6 \leq t \leq 10 \end{cases} \quad (133)$$

and

$$\lambda_4 = -u \quad (134)$$

Here $\mu(\cdot) = 0$, $v_{S_1} = 0$, $v_{S_2} = 0$, $v_{S_3} = \frac{15}{128}$, and $v_{S_4} = 0$ at entry and exit. All of Speyer's optimality conditions are satisfied and the value of the cost

functional is 0.293. Also, Bryson, Denham and Dreyfus' necessary conditions are satisfied with

$$\nu_{b_1} = 0, \quad \nu_{b_2} = 0, \quad \nu_{b_3} = \frac{30}{128}, \quad \nu_{b_4} = \frac{30}{128}$$

and

$$\gamma(\cdot) = 0 \quad 0 \leq t \leq 4, \quad 6 \leq t \leq 10$$

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{15}{128}(6 - t), \quad 4 \leq t \leq 6$$

However, the unconstrained optimal trajectory given below, turns out to be feasible,[†] and gives a cost of 0.2897. Other stationary trajectories are ruled out as the problem is convex. This implies that the necessary conditions of Bryson, Denham and Dreyfus and Speyer have yielded a spurious extremal.

Unconstrained trajectory

$$u = bt^2 + ct + d \tag{135}$$

$$x_1 = \frac{bt^6}{360} + \frac{ct^5}{120} + \frac{dt^4}{24} + \frac{15t^3}{96} - \frac{15t^2}{24} + \frac{15t}{12} \tag{136}$$

$$x_2 = \frac{bt^5}{60} + \frac{ct^4}{24} + \frac{dt^3}{6} + \frac{15t^2}{32} - \frac{15t}{12} + \frac{15}{12} \tag{137}$$

$$x_3 = \frac{bt^4}{12} + \frac{ct^3}{6} + \frac{dt^2}{2} + \frac{15t}{16} - \frac{15}{12} \tag{138}$$

$$x_4 = \frac{bt^3}{3} + \frac{ct^2}{2} + dt + \frac{15}{16} \tag{139}$$

where $b = -0.02025$, $c = 0.2025$, $d = -0.525$. Fig. 3 shows x_1 for both cases.

10. Conclusions

We have considered the question of necessary conditions for optimality of state-constrained control problems. Two approaches were used. In the

[†] Note that for certain initial conditions optimal trajectories will lie along the constraint boundary; expression (89) suggests this.




FIG. 3 FOURTH ORDER PROBLEM : $x_1(\cdot)$ vs. TIME

first, necessary conditions were obtained by limiting arguments based on the well-known Kelley penalty technique. The second approach utilized functional analysis and variational theory; the significant difference was that, unlike [3] and [7] no a priori constraints were imposed to ensure feasibility. Our necessary conditions yield a considerable simplification in the junction conditions on the influence functions over those obtained by previous researchers. We do not imply that the necessary conditions obtained by previous workers are incorrect, but rather, that, inasmuch as they overspecify the conditions at the junction, there exists the possibility of non-stationary solutions satisfying these conditions as shown in Section 9. Thus misleading results may be obtained using the existing necessary conditions. Our necessary conditions yield extremals.

For the regular case, we have discovered that, if $p^{-1}_- \neq p^{-1}_+$, problems with odd-ordered constraints do not have boundary arcs, (as opposed to boundary points). We feel that this result has a two-fold significance; first, it yields further insight into the structure of solutions of state constrained problems, and second, it provides one more clue towards the connection between state-constrained and singular problems, which has been speculated upon elsewhere [25].

The comparatively simple form of the new necessary conditions should stimulate research into new, efficient techniques for solving state constrained optimal control problems.

References

1. Gamkrelidze, R.V., "Optimal Processes with Bounded Phase Coordinates," *Izv. Akad. Nauk, USSR, Ser. Mat.*, Vol. 24, pp. 315-356, 1960.
2. Berkovitz, L.D., "On Control Problems with Bounded State Variables," *J. Math. Anal. and Appl.*, Vol. 5, pp. 488-498, 1962.
3. Bryson, A.E. Jr., Denham, W.F., and Dreyfus, S.E., "Optimal Programming Problems with Inequality Constraints I: Necessary Conditions for Extremal Solutions," *J. AIAA*, Vol. 1, No. 11, p. 2544-2550, Nov. 1963.
4. Chang, S.S.L., "Optimal Control in Bounded Phase Space," *Automatica*, Vol. 1, pp. 55-67, 1962.
5. Dreyfus, S.E., "Dynamic Programming and the Calculus of Variations," Academic Press, New York, 1965.
6. Speyer, J.L., *ibid*, p. 184, footnote.
7. Speyer, J.L., "Optimization and Control of Nonlinear Systems with Inflight Constraints," Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, Feb. 1968; also Speyer, J.L. and Bryson, A.E. Jr., "Optimal Programming Problems with a Bounded State Space," *J. AIAA*, Vol. 6, pp. 1488-1491, 1968.
8. McIntyre, J., and Paiewonsky, B., "On Optimal Control with Bounded State Variables," *Advances in Control Systems*, Vol. 5 (ed. C. T. Leondes), Academic Press, New York, 1967.
9. Dreyfus, S.E., "Variational Problems with State Variable Inequality Constraints," Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1962.
10. Berkovitz, L.D., and Dreyfus, S.E., "The equivalence of Some Necessary Conditions for Optimal Control Problems with Bounded State Variables," *J. Math. Anal. and Appl.*, Vol. 10, pp. 275-283, 1965.
11. Denham, W.F., and Bryson, A.E. Jr., "Optimal Programming Problems with Inequality Constraints II: Solution by Steepest Ascent," *J. AIAA*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 25-34, Jan. 1964. (Also, W.F. Denham, "Steepest Ascent Solution of Optimal Programming Problems, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, April 1963.)
12. Kelley, H.J., "Method of Gradients," in *Optimization Techniques* (ed. G. Leitmann) Academic Press, New York, 1962.
13. Courant, R., "Variational Methods for the Solution of Problems of Equilibrium and Vibrations," *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 49, pp. 1-23, 1943.

14. Lasdon, L.S., Waren, A.D., and Rice, R.K., "An Interior Penalty Method for Inequality Constrained Optimal Control Problems," IEEE Trans. Autom. Control, Vol. AC-12, No. 4, pp. 132-138, Aug. 1967.
15. Butler, T., and Martin, A.V., "On a Method of Courant for Minimizing Functionals," J. Maths. and Phys., Vol. 41, pp. 291-299, 1962.
16. Russell, D.L., "Penalty Functions and Bounded Phase Co-ordinates," S.I.A.M. J. on Control, Vol. 2, pp. 409-422, 1965.
17. Lele, M. M., and Jacobson, D.H., "A Proof of the Convergence of the Kelley-Bryson Penalty Function Technique for State-Constrained Control Problems," J. Math. Anal. and Appl., Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 163-169, 1969.
18. Cullum, J., "Penalty Functions and Non-Convex Continuous Optimal Control Problems," Proc. 2nd. Int. Conf. Comp. Methods and Opt. Problems, San Remo, Italy, Sept. 1968 (To appear).
19. Beltrami, E.J., "On Infinite Dimensional Convex Programs," J. Comp. and Sys. Sci., Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 323-329, 1967.
20. Arrow, K.J., Hurwicz, L., Uzawa, H., "Studies in Linear and Non-Linear Programming," Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1958.
21. Russell, D.L., "The Kuhn-Tucker Conditions in Banach Space with an Application to Control Theory," J. Math. Anal. and Appl., Vol. 15, pp. 200-212, 1966.
22. Luenberger, D.G., "Optimization by Vector Space Methods," J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1969.
23. Yosida, K., "Functional Analysis," Springer-Verlag, New York Inc., 1968.
24. Pettis, B.J., "Convex Sets in Linear Spaces: Two Applications of Zorn's Lemma," Seminar on convex sets, Instt. for Ad. Study, Princeton, N.J., 1949-1950.
25. Jacobson, D.H., and Lele, M.M., "A Transformation Technique for Optimal Control Problems with a State Variable Inequality Constraint," IEEE Trans. Autom. Control, Vol. AC-14 to appear; also preprints 1969 Joint Automatic Control Conference, Boulder, Colorado, pp. 52-59.
26. Thrasher, G.J., "Optimal Programming for Aircraft Trajectories Utilizing a New Strategy for Handling State Inequality Constraints," AIAA Aircraft Design and Operations Meeting paper No. 69-812, Los Angeles, Calif., July 14-16, 1969.
27. Bryson, A.E. Jr. and Ho, Y.C., "Applied Optimal Control," Blaisdell, Waltham, 1969.

Joint Service Electronics Program
N00014-74-A-0248-0006 1974 and 1975

Academy Library (DSLR)
U. S. Air Force Academy
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80900

Mr. AMSC (ASST)
Attn: Library/Document
Arnold AFB, Texas 73744

Aeronautics Library
Graduate Aeronautical Laboratories
California Institute of Technology
1205 E. California Blvd.
Pasadena, California 91106

Aerospace Corporation
P. O. Box 4965
Los Angeles, California 90045
Attn: Library Acquisitions Group

Airborne Instruments Laboratory
Dayton, New York 11724

AFAP (AVT)/R. D. Latham
Wright-Patterson AFB
Ohio 45433

AFCEC (CEN/PLR)
AFCEC Library, Stop 24
L. C. Mason Field
Bedford, Mass. 01731

ADTC (ADDP-13)
Eglin AFB
Florida 32424

AFETR Technical Library
ICTV, MD-1195
Patrick AFB, Florida 32925

Atmospheric Sciences Office
Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory
White Sands Missile Range
New Mexico 88202

ADTC (ADDP-13)
Eglin AFB
Florida 32424

Case Institute of Technology
Engineering Division
University Circle
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

ADULT-1403
Maxwell AFB
Alabama 36112

Commanding Officer
Naval Weapons Center
Coronado Laboratories
Attn: Library
Coronado, California 91720

Commander
U. S. Naval Missile Center
Point Mugu, California 93441

Deputy for Research and Engineering
LAWFEE (GSE)
U. S. Army Weapons Command
Rock Island Arsenal
Rock Island, Illinois 61211

Hollander Associates
P. O. Box 2276
Palmdale, California 91353

Carnegie Institute of Technology
Electrical Engineering Dept.
Pittsburg, Pa. 15131

Central Intelligence Agency
Attn: OCS/DD Publications
Washington, D. C. 20505

Dr. C. M. Jansky, AMSEL-HL-NYOR
Night Vision Laboratory, USAECOM
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20340

Director, Electronic Programs
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20340

Commander
U. S. Army and General Staff College
Attn: Acquisition, Lib. Div.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 64530

Commander (ADL)
Naval Air Development Center
Beverly, Maryland
Washington, Pa. 14776

Technical Director (M/FA-2030-107-1)
Frankford Arsenal
Philadelphia, Pa. 19137

Commander
U. S. Army Air Defense School
Attn: Missile Science Div. C & S Dept.
P. O. Box 9350
Fort Bliss, Texas 79916

U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research
and Development Center
Attn: Technical Document Center, Bldg. 115
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Commanding General
Attn: STEWS-RE-L Technical Library
White Sands Missile Range
New Mexico 88202

Commanding General
U. S. Army Electronics Command
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703

ATTN: AMSEL-SC
HL-P (AM, D. Hopta)
HL-BM (Dir. Schief/
RD-MT
HL-C
HL-D
HL-E (Mr. R. Bauer)
HL-F (Mr. R. J. Niemelä)
HL-G (Dr. W. K. McKee)
HL-H
HL-I
HL-J (Mr. R. Kelley)
HL-K
HL-L
HL-M (Dr. H. Jacobs)
HL-N
HL-O
HL-P
HL-Q
HL-R
HL-S (Dr. H. Jacobs)
HL-T
HL-U
HL-V

Commanding General
U. S. Army Missile Command
Attn: AMSCD-TP
Washington, D. C. 20315

University of California
U. S. Army Missile Command
Attn: Technical Library, AMSEL-HL-NYOR
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35894

Commanding Officer
Naval Air Station
Indianapolis, Indiana 46241

Attn: Library
White Sands Missile Range (2)
Attn: Library
Commanding Officer (Code 753)
Naval Weapons Center
China Lake, California 93556

Attn: Technical Library
Commanding Officer
Naval Training Device Center
Orlando, Florida 32811

Deputy Director and Chief Scientist
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
1010 East Green Street
Pasadena, California 91101

Commanding Officer
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
218 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Commanding Officer
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
415 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

U. S. Post Office Department
12th & Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20535

Commanding Officer
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
Box 11, FPO
New York, New York 04110

Project Manager
Common Planning and Navigation
Systems
Attn: Harold M. Rahr (AMCPM-NS-141)
Building 41
U. S. Army Electronics Command
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703

Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Electronics R & D Activity
White Sands Missile Range
New Mexico 88202

Director of Faculty Research
Department of the Air Force
USAF Academy
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80843

Richard O. Vlach (CRDAB-IPD)
U. S. Army Research Office (Durham)
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Commanding General
U. S. Army Strategic Comm. Command
Attn: SCC-CCS-245
Fort Meade, Arizona 45613

Commanding Officer
Harry Diamond Laboratories
Attn: Dr. Berthold Altman (ASXDD-11)
Connecticut Avenue and Van Ness St. NW
Washington, D. C. 20438

Commanding Officer
Human Engineering Laboratories
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Maryland 21005

Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Ballistics Research Lab
Attn: AMSEL-BAT
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Aberdeen, Maryland 21005

Director, USAF Project RAND
VAC, Air Force Liaison Office
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California 90406

Attn: Library
Director
U. S. Army Engineer Geodetic,
Research and Development Agency
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Dr. C. M. W. Winkler
Director, Tire Service Division
U. S. Naval Observatory
Washington, D. C. 20350

Commander, U. S. Naval Security Group Com
Attn: GSI
3801 Nicholas Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20350

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics
130 Pierce Hall
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Ms. MDD (ERT)
L. G. Mason Field
Bedford, Mass. 01731

European Office of Aerospace Research
APO
New York 09567

Prof. J. J. D'Amico
Dept. of Electrical Engineering
Air Force Institute of Technology
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

Lincoln Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Lexington, Mass. 02173

Professor Nicholas George
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109

Dr. John C. Haxton, Head
School of Electrical Engineering
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Dr. H. Harrison, Code BRC
Chief, Electronics Branch
NSAS
Washington, D. C. 20546

Head, Technical Services Division
Naval Facilities Service
4420 North Fairfax Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22203

Director
Defense Communications Agency (540)
Washington, D. C. 20315

Dr. L. M. Hollingsworth
AFCEC (ICN)
L. C. Mason Field
Bedford, Massachusetts 01731

Attn: Library
Lafayette-Mellon University
Schuylkill Park
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15261

The Johns Hopkins University
Applied Physics Laboratory
8301 George Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Attn: Electronic Laboratories
Lt. Col. Robert B. Kelnick (SREK)
Chief, Electronics Division
Directorate of Engineering Sciences
Air Force Office of Scientific Research
Arlington, Virginia 22204

U. S. Army Limited War Laboratory
Attn: Technical Director
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Aberdeen, Maryland 21005

Commanding Officer
Army Materials Research
Watertown Arsenal
Watertown, Massachusetts 02127

Commanding General
U. S. Army Scientific Agency
Arlington Hall Station
Arlington, Virginia 22212

Commanding Officer and Director
U. S. Naval Undersea Sound Lab
Fort Dumfries
New London, Connecticut 06340

Defense Documentation Center
Attn: DDC-TEA
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22304

Dt. No. 4, OAR
Air Force Unit Post Office
Los Angeles, California 90045

Director
Advanced Research Projects Agency
Department of Defense
Washington, D. C. 20301

Director for Materials Science
Advanced Research Projects Agency
Department of Defense
Washington, D. C. 20301

Director
Columbia Radiation Laboratory
Columbia University
105 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

Director
Coordinated Science Laboratory
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Director
Electronic Research Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Director
Electronic Sciences Laboratory
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90089

Director
Microbeam Physics Laboratory
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Mr. Robert O. Parker, AMSEL-RD-S
Executive Secretary, STAC
U. S. Army Electronics Command
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703

Director
National Security Agency
Fort George G. Meade
Maryland 20715

Director
Naval Research Laboratory
Technical Information Office
Washington, D. C. 20390

Attn: GSI
3801 Nicholas Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20350

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics
130 Pierce Hall
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Ms. MDD (ERT)
L. G. Mason Field
Bedford, Mass. 01731

European Office of Aerospace Research
APO
New York 09567

Prof. J. J. D'Amico
Dept. of Electrical Engineering
Air Force Institute of Technology
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

Lincoln Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Lexington, Mass. 02173

Professor Nicholas George
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109

Dr. John C. Haxton, Head
School of Electrical Engineering
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Dr. H. Harrison, Code BRC
Chief, Electronics Branch
NSAS
Washington, D. C. 20546

Director
Air Force Avionics Laboratory
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

NASA Lewis Research Center
Attn: Library
21000 Brookpark Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44135

Dr. R. A. E. Jones
Systems Research Laboratories Inc.
7501 Indian Ridge Road
Dayton, Ohio 45421

Nuclear Instrumentation Group
Attn: Library
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Systems Electronic Systems
Applied Research Laboratory
Attn: Document Libraries
40 Silver Road
Waltham, Mass. 02154

Naval Air Systems Command
Attn: D
Washington, D. C. 20340

Naval Electronics Systems Command
ELK 5, Rm. 205 Mountains Bldg
Dept. of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20346

Naval Ship Systems Command
SHIP 01
Washington, D. C. 20340

Naval Ship Systems Command
SHIP 01
Washington, D. C. 20340

New York University
College of Engineering
New York, New York 10019

Dr. H. V. Noble (CAVT)
Air Force Avionics Laboratory
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

Office of Deputy Director
Office of Research and Development
Department of Defense
Washington, D. C. 20301

Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
55 Johnson Street
Brooklyn, New York 11203

Attn: Mr. Jerome Fox
Research Coordinator

Rams Air Development Center
Griffith AFB, Texas 75468
Attn: Document Library (EMTLD)

Raytheon Co.
Bedford, Mass. 01710
Attn: Library

AFSC (ICTE)
Air Force Research Base
Maryland 20911

Dr. A. A. Dougl
Asst. Director of Research
Systems Integration Division
Code 536A, Box 15
Naval Missile Center
Washington, D. C. 20301

Union Carbide Corporation
Research Division
P. O. Box 1289
Morrisville, California 94041

Dr. M. Rohl, Deputy Chief Scientist
U. S. Army Research Office (Durham)
Box CM, Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27705

Dr. Sheldon J. Wallis
Electronic Properties Information Center
Hughes Aircraft Company
Mail Station 8-175
Culver City, California 90230

School of Engineering Sciences
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Ms. RAMMO (MSTA/L. Nelsma)
AF Unit Post Office
Los Angeles, California 90045

Raytheon Company
Research Division Library
28 Bayne Street
Waltham, Mass. 02154

USAFAPM (SAMOR)
Brooks Air Force Base
Texas 78235

Syracuse University
Department of Electrical Engineering
Syracuse, New York 13210

Government Publications Section
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Engineering and Math. Sciences Library
University of California at L. A.
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

Prof. Joseph E. Rowe, Chairman
University of Michigan
Electrical Engineering Department
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

U. S. Army Munitions Command
Attn: Technical Information Branch
Pittsfield Arsenal, SHUPA-VAB
Dover, New Jersey 07801

U. S. Army Research Office
Physical & Engineering Sciences Div.
1045 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

Dr. A. D. Schneider, AMSEL-HL-NYV
Night Vision Laboratory, USAECOM
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Department of Electrical Engineering
Texas Technological College
Lubbock, Texas 79409

U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory
Dalgon, Virginia 22445

Attn: Library (ASST)
The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20310

Director
The Walter Reed Institute of Research
Walter Reed Medical Center
Washington, D. C. 20314

Missile Electronic Warfare
Technical Area, AMSEL-WT-MI
White Sands Missile Range
New Mexico 88202

The University of Iowa
The University Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Lockport Electric Co. Inc.
1155 County Road
San Carlos, California 94070

Attn: Mr. E. E. Peterson
Yale University
Engineering Department
New Haven, Connecticut 06510

Philco-Ford Corporation
Communications and Electronics Div.
Univ. Heights and Jolly Roads
Blue Bell, Pa. 19012

Dr. Leo Young
Stanford Research Institute
Menlo Park, California 94025

Ms. AMD (AMR)
Brooks Air Force Base
Texas 78235

Morton M. Paster, Chief
AFSC Scientific & Technical Liaison Office
34 Federal Plaza, Rm. 1311
New York, New York 10007

Library (G02414)
U. S. Navy Post Graduate School
Navy Postgraduate School
Attn: Technical Report Section

Director
Electronic Research Center
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

Mr. H. E. Webb (EMIR)
Along the Development Center
Griffith Air Force Base
New York 11600

Col. E. P. Galt, Jr.
ACDA/FO
161 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20545

Mr. Billy Locke
Technical Aspects, Requirements
USAF Security Review
Kitty Hawk Air Force Base, Texas 76141

Weapons Systems Evaluation Group
Attn: Colonel Blaine O. Vogt
485 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202

Ms. USAF (AMDDG)
The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20301

W. A. Eberbacher, Assoc. Head
Systems Integration Division
Code 536A, Box 15
Naval Missile Center
Washington, D. C. 20301

Glen A. Myers (Code 31M)
Chief, Office of Science and Technology
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940

Mr. Norman J. Paul, AMSEL-RD-S
Chief, Office of Science and Technology
R and D Directorate
U. S. Army Electronics Command
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703

Fedstone Scientific Information Center
Attn: Chief, Document Section
U. S. Army Missile Command
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35899

Federal Aviation Administration
Attn: Admin. Serv. Div. (445-110)
600 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20595

Mr. M. Zee Thoren, Chief
Network Engineering, Communications
and Operations Branch
Lester Hill National Center for
Biomedical Communications
8100 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Syracuse University
Department of Electrical Engineering
Syracuse, New York 13210

Government Publications Section
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Engineering and Math. Sciences Library
University of California at L. A.
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

Prof. Joseph E. Rowe, Chairman
University of Michigan
Electrical Engineering Department
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

U. S. Army Munitions Command
Attn: Technical Information Branch
Pittsfield Arsenal, SHUPA-VAB
Dover, New Jersey 07801

U. S. Army Research Office
Physical & Engineering Sciences Div.
1045 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

Dr. A. D. Schneider, AMSEL-HL-NYV
Night Vision Laboratory, USAECOM
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Department of Electrical Engineering
Texas Technological College
Lubbock, Texas 79409

U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory
Dalgon, Virginia 22445

Unclassified

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D

Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Division of Engineering and Applied Physics Harvard University Cambridge, Mass. 02138		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
3. REPORT TITLE NEW NECESSARY CONDITIONS OF OPTIMALITY FOR CONTROL PROBLEMS WITH STATE-VARIABLE INEQUALITY CONSTRAINTS		2b. GROUP	
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and, inclusive dates) Interim technical report			
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name) D. H. Jacobson, M. M. Lele, and J. L. Speyer			
6. REPORT DATE August 1969	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS 26	
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. N00014-67-A-0298-0006 and NASA	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Technical Report No. 597		
b. PROJECT NO. Grant NGR 22-007-068	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)		
c.			
d.			
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted by the U. S. Government.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Office of Naval Research	
13. ABSTRACT <p>Necessary conditions of optimality for state-variable inequality constrained problems are derived by examining the limiting behavior of the Kelley penalty function technique. The conditions so obtained differ from those presently known, with regard to the behavior of the adjoint variables at junctions of interior and boundary arcs. A second, rigorous, derivation is given; this confirms the necessary conditions obtained by the limiting argument. These conditions are related to those known earlier; in particular, it is shown that the earlier conditions over-specify the behavior of the adjoint variables at the junctions. An example is used to demonstrate that the earlier conditions may yield non-stationary trajectories.</p> <p>For the regular case, it is shown that, under certain conditions, only boundary points, as opposed to boundary arcs, are possible. An analytic example illustrates this behavior.</p>			

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
State Variable Constraints Phase Variable Constraints Necessary Conditions Optimal Control Theory Constrained Extremals						